

SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS

L.1 SECTION L PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

- 52.204-6 DATA UNIVERSAL NUMBERING SYSTEM (DUNS) NUMBER (APR 2008)**
- 52.214-34 SUBMISSION OF OFFERS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (APR 1991)**
- 52.214-35 SUBMISSION OF OFFERS IN U.S. CURRENCY (APR 1991)**
- 52.215-1 INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS--COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION (JAN 2004)**
- 52.215-16 FACILITIES CAPITAL COST OF MONEY (JUN 2003)**
- 52.215-22 LIMITATIONS ON PASS-THROUGH CHARGES – IDENTIFICATION OF SUBCONTRACT EFFORT (OCT 2009)**
- 52.219-24 SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PROGRAM-TARGETS (OCT 2000)**
- 52.222-24 PREAWARD ON-SITE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMPLIANCE EVALUATION (FEB 1999)**
- 1852.227-71 REQUESTS FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS TO INVENTIONS (APR 1984)**

L.2 COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING THIS SOLICITATION

Any questions or comments regarding this solicitation shall cite the solicitation number and be directed to the following Government representative:

Name: Jennifer O’Connell, Contracting Officer
 Phone: 301-286-5081 (collect calls not accepted)
 FAX: 301-286-5373
 E-Mail: Jennifer.A.OConnell@nasa.gov
 *Address: Goddard Space Flight Center
 Greenbelt, MD 20771
 Attention: Jennifer O’Connell, *Mail Code: 210.5

*(Note: Must be complete, including Mail Code, on all transmittals.)

The Government will answer relevant and appropriate questions regarding this solicitation. Any offeror questions should be submitted as soon as possible.

(End of provision)

L.3 52.211-4 AVAILABILITY FOR EXAMINATION OF SPECIFICATIONS NOT LISTED IN THE GSA INDEX OF FEDERAL SPECIFICATIONS, STANDARDS AND COMMERCIAL ITEM DESCRIPTION (JUNE 1988)

The GGSG procurement library:

<http://science.gsfc.nasa.gov/690/GGSG/index.html>

(End of provision)

L.4 1852.223-73 SAFETY AND HEALTH PLAN (NOV 2004)

(a) The offeror shall submit a detailed safety and occupational health plan as part of its proposal (see NPR 8715.3, NASA Safety Manual, Appendices). The plan shall include a detailed discussion of the policies, procedures, and techniques that will be used to ensure the safety and occupational health of Contractor employees and to ensure the safety of all working conditions throughout the performance of the contract.

(b) When applicable, the plan shall address the policies, procedures, and techniques that will be used to ensure the safety and occupational health of the public, astronauts and pilots, the NASA workforce (including Contractor employees working on NASA contracts), and high-value equipment and property.

(c) The plan shall similarly address subcontractor employee safety and occupational health for those proposed subcontracts that contain one or more of the following conditions:

(1) The work will be conducted completely or partly on premises owned or controlled by the government.

(2) The work includes construction, alteration, or repair of facilities in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold.

(3) The work, regardless of place of performance, involves hazards that could endanger the public, astronauts and pilots, the NASA workforce (including Contractor employees working on NASA contracts), or high value equipment or property, and the hazards are not adequately

addressed by Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) or Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations (if applicable).

(4) When the assessed risk and consequences of a failure to properly manage and control the hazards warrants use of the clause.

(d) This plan, as approved by the Contracting Officer, will be included in any resulting contract.

(End of provision)

L.5 52.216-1 TYPE OF CONTRACT (APR 1984)

The Government contemplates award of a Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract resulting from this solicitation.

(End of provision)

L.6 52.233-2 SERVICE OF PROTEST (SEP 2006)

(a) Protests, as defined in section 33.101 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that are filed directly with an agency, and copies of any protests that are filed with the Government Accountability Office (GAO), shall be served on the Contracting Officer (addressed as follows) by obtaining written and dated acknowledgment of receipt from:

Building 16W-Shipping and Receiving Dock

Building 25, Room N-40

Solicitation Number RFP _NNG10316070R_____

Attn: Ms. Jennifer O'Connell Mail Code 210.5

Goddard Space Flight Center

Greenbelt, MD 20771

(b) The copy of any protest shall be received in the office designated above within one day of filing a protest with the GAO.

(End of provision)

**L.7 52.252-1 SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE
(FEB 1998)**

This solicitation incorporates one or more solicitation provisions by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. The offeror is cautioned that the listed provisions may include blocks that must be completed by the offeror and submitted with its quotation or offer. In lieu of submitting the full text of those provisions, the offeror may identify the provision by paragraph identifier and provide the appropriate information with its quotation or offer. Also, the full text of a solicitation provision may be accessed electronically at this/these address(es): Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) clauses:

<http://www.acqnet.gov/far/>

NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) clauses:

<http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/procurement/regs/nfstoc.htm>

(End of provision)

L.8 1852.227-84 PATENT RIGHTS CLAUSES (DECEMBER 1989)

This solicitation contains the patent rights clauses of [FAR 52.227-11](#) (as modified by the NFS) and [NFS 1852.227-70](#). If the contract resulting from this solicitation is awarded to a small business or nonprofit organization, the clause at NFS 1852.227-70 shall not apply. If the award is to other than a small business or nonprofit organization, the clause at [FAR 52.227-11](#) shall not apply.

(End of Provision)

**L.9 1852.231-71 DETERMINATION OF COMPENSATION REASONABLENESS
(MAR 1994)**

(a) The proposal shall include a total compensation plan. This plan shall address all proposed labor categories, including those personnel subject to union agreements, the Service Contract Act, and those exempt from both of the above. The total compensation plan shall include the salaries/wages, fringe benefits and leave programs proposed for each of these categories of labor. The plan also shall include a discussion of the consistency of the plan among the categories of labor being proposed. Differences between benefits offered professional and non-professional employees shall be highlighted. The requirements of this plan may be combined with that required by the clause at FAR 52.222-46, "Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees."

(b) The offeror shall provide written support to demonstrate that its proposed compensation is reasonable.

(c) The offeror shall include the rationale for any conformance procedures used or those Service Contract Act employees proposed that do not fall within the scope of any classification listed in the applicable wage determination.

(d) The offeror shall require all service subcontractors (1) with proposed cost reimbursement or non-competitive fixed-price type subcontracts having a total potential value in excess of \$500,000 and (2) the cumulative value of all their service subcontracts under the proposed prime contract in excess of 10 percent of the prime contract's total potential value, provide as part of their proposals the information identified in (a) through (c) of this provision.

(End of provision)

L.10 1852.233-70 PROTESTS TO NASA (OCT 2002)

Potential bidders or offerors may submit a protest under 48 CFR Part 33 (FAR Part 33) directly to the Contracting Officer. As an alternative to the Contracting Officer's consideration of a protest, a potential bidder or offeror may submit the protest to the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, who will serve as or designate the official responsible for conducting an independent review. Protests requesting an independent review shall be addressed to Assistant Administrator for Procurement, NASA Code H, Washington, DC 20546-0001.

(End of provision)

**L.11 1852.245-80 GOVERNMENT PROPERTY MANAGEMENT INFORMATION
(DEVIATION) (SEP 2007)**

(a) The offeror shall identify the industry leading or voluntary consensus standards, and/or the industry leading practices, that it intends to employ for the management of Government property under any contract awarded from this solicitation.

(b) The offeror shall provide the date of its last Government property control system analysis along with its overall status, a summary of findings and recommendations, the status of any recommended corrective actions, the name of the Government activity that performed the analysis, and the latest available contact information for that activity.

(c) The offeror shall identify any property it intends to use in performance of this contract from the list of available Government property in the provision at 1852.245-81, List of Available Government Property.

(d) The offeror shall identify all Government property in its possession, provided under other Government contracts that it intends to use in the performance of this contract. The offeror shall also identify: the contract that provided the property, the responsible contracting officer, the dates during which the property will be available for use (including the first, last, and all intervening months), and, for any property that will be used concurrently in performing two or more contracts, the amounts of the respective uses in sufficient detail to support prorating the rent, the amount of rent that would otherwise be charged in accordance with FAR 52.245-9, Use and Charges, and the contact information for the responsible Government contracting officer. The offeror shall provide proof that such use was authorized by the responsible contracting officer.

(e) The offeror shall disclose cost accounting practices that allow for direct charging of commercially available equipment, when commercially available equipment is to be used in performance of the contract and the equipment is not a deliverable.

(f) The offeror shall identify, in list form, any equipment that it intends to acquire and directly charge to the Government under this contract. The list shall include a description, manufacturer, model number (when available), quantity required, and estimated unit cost.

(g) The offeror shall disclose its intention to acquire any parts, supplies, materials or equipment, to fabricate an item of equipment for use under any contract resulting from this solicitation when that item of equipment: will be titled to the government under the provisions of the contract; is not included as a contract deliverable; and the Contractor intends to charge the costs of materials directly to the contract. The disclosure shall be in list form, parts shall be grouped by and identify the end item or system and shall include all descriptive information, manufacturer, model, part, catalog or other identification numbers (when available), quantities required, and estimated unit costs.

(h) Existing available Government property listed in the provision at 1852.245-81 is provided

"as is". NASA makes no warranty regarding its performance or condition. The offeror uses this property at its own risk and should make its own assessment of the property's suitability for use. The equitable adjustment provisions of the clause at 52.245-1, Government Property, are not applicable to this property. The offeror must obtain the Contracting Officer's written approval before acquiring replacement property when it intends to charge the cost directly to the contract.

(i) Existing Government property may be renewed at the following locations, dates, and times:
None.

(End of Provision)

**L.12 1852.245-81 LIST OF AVAILABLE GOVERNMENT PROPERTY (DEVIATION)
(SEP 2007)**

(a) The Government will make the following Government property available for use in performance of the contract resulting from this solicitation, on a no-charge-for-use basis in accordance with FAR 52.245-1, Government Property. The offeror shall notify the Government, as part of its proposal, of its intention to use or not use the property.

Section J, Attachment C – Installation Accountable Government Property

(b) The Government will make the following Government property available for use in performance of the contract resulting from this solicitation, on a no-charge-for-use basis in accordance with FAR 52.245-2, Government Property Installation Operation Services. The offeror shall notify the Government of its intention to use or not use the property.

Section J, Attachment C – Installation Accountable Government Property

(c) The selected Contractor will be responsible for costs associated with transportation, and installation of the property listed in this provision.

(End of provision)

L.13 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS (AUG 2009)

It is NASA's intent, by providing the instructions set forth below, to solicit information that will demonstrate the offeror's competence to successfully complete the requirements specified in the Statement of Work (SOW), Attachment A, and Representative Task Orders 1 and 2. Generally, the proposal should:

- Demonstrate understanding of the overall and specific requirements of the proposed contract.
- Convey the company's capabilities for transforming understanding into accomplishment.
- Present in detail, the plans and methods for so doing.
- Present the costs associated with so doing.

In the event that other organizations are proposed as being involved in conducting this work, their relationships during the effort shall be explained and their proposed contributions shall be identified and integrated into each part of the proposal, as appropriate.

As part of the Request for Proposal, the offer shall respond to how they would approach several Representative Task Orders (See L.15). **THE OFFEROR IS NOT TO PERFORM ANY ACTUAL WORK OR PRODUCE ANY DELIVERABLES ON THE REPRESENTATIVE TASK ORDERS (RTOs) IN RESPONSE TO THE RFP!**

(a) PROPOSAL FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION

(1) Offerors shall submit proposals in four volumes as specified below:

Volume	Title	Copies
I	Offer Volume	Original plus 2 Hard Copies and two electronic copies
II	Mission Suitability Volume	Original plus 6 Hard Copies and two electronic copies
III	Cost Volume	Original plus 6 Hard Copies, and one additional copy for DCAA and two electronic copies
IV	Past Performance Volume	Original plus 6 Hard Copies and two electronic copies

(2) With regard to the cost volume, Offerors and proposed significant subcontractors defined as any subcontract that exceeds 20% of each individual proposed Representative Task Order (RTO) estimate shall forward one (1) additional copy of their Cost Proposal, marked “NNG10316070R/NASA Proposal Evaluation Material”, to their cognizant Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) office. A copy of the proposal transmittal letter to DCAA shall be forwarded to the Contracting Officer for each cost proposal (prime and significant subcontractors) responding to this RFP.

(3) All pages of Volumes I, II, III, and IV shall be numbered and identified with the offeror’s name, RFP number and date. Subsequent revisions, if requested, shall be similarly identified to show revision number and date. A table of contents shall be provided with figures and tables listed separately.

(4) Two electronic copies of the offeror’s proposal, designating one as “back-up,” shall be submitted (in addition to the hardcopies specified above) in Microsoft Word 2007, or Portable Document Format (version 5.0 or greater). Cost proposal charts shall use Microsoft Excel 2007 with active formulas. Electronic files of Volumes I, II, III, and IV shall be on virus free CD-ROM (CD-R format) discs with an external label indicating: (1) the name of the offeror, (2) the RFP number, (3) the format and software versions used, (4) a list of the files contained on the disk and (5) date of the information. **In the event of any inconsistency between data provided on electronic media and hard copies, the hard copy data will be considered to be correct.**

(5) The format for each proposal volume shall parallel, to the greatest extent possible, the format of the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in Section M of this

solicitation. The proposal content shall provide a basis for evaluation against the requirements of the solicitation. Each volume of the proposal shall specify the relevant evaluation criteria being addressed, if appropriate. The proposal shall include a matrix showing where in the proposal the technical requirements of only the selected functions of the SOW and the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied (i.e. SOW element versus offeror's proposal page numbers). It is intended that this be a simple matrix that should in no way inhibit an innovative approach or burden the offeror. This proposal matrix is excluded from the page limitations contained in paragraph (b)(1) below.

(6) Information shall be precise, factual, detailed and complete. Offerors shall not assume that the evaluation team is aware of company abilities, capabilities, plans, facilities, organization or any other pertinent fact that is important to accomplishment of the work as specified in the SOW. The evaluation will be based primarily on the information presented in the written proposal. The proposal shall specifically address each listed evaluation factor and subfactor.

(b) PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS

(1) The following table contains the page limitations for each portion of the proposal submitted in response to this solicitation. Additional instructions for each component of the proposal are located in the contract provision noted under the Reference heading.

Proposal Component	Volume	Reference	Page Limitations
Offer Volume	I	L.14	None
Mission Suitability Volume	II	L.15	80 Pages
(a) Cover Page, Indices, SOW Compliance Matrix, Quality Assurance Plan, Total Compensation Plan, Phase-in Plan, Safety and Health Plan, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, and List of Acronyms			Excluded
(b) Deviations & Exceptions			Excluded

Proposal Component	Volume	Reference	Page Limitations
Cost Volume	III	L.16	Mixed
(a) Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates, and Fee Matrices (Attachment B)			None
(b) Cost Exhibits			None
(c) Basis of Estimates			50 Pages*
(d) Deviations/Exceptions			Excluded
Past Performance Volume	IV	L.17	Mixed
(a) Information from the Offeror			40 Pages*
(b) Cover Page, Indices, Past Performance Questionnaires, Customer Evaluations, Termination/Descope information, Written Consent of Proposed Significant Subs, Teaming Agreements or Other Contractual Agreements, Small Business Plan History and List of Acronyms			Excluded
(c) Deviations & Exceptions			Excluded

* Total pages is inclusive of Prime and each Significant Subcontractor.

Note, the definition of a significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation.

(2) A page is defined as one side of a sheet, 8-1/2" x 11", with at least one inch margins on all sides, using not smaller than 12 point type Times New Roman font. Line spacing or the amount of vertical space between lines of text shall not be less than single line (Microsoft Word's default line spacing). Character spacing shall be "Normal", not "Expanded" or "Condensed." The margins may contain headers and footers, but shall not contain any proposal content to be evaluated. Foldouts count as an equivalent number of 8-1/2" x 11" pages. The metric standard format most closely approximating the described standard 8-1/2" x 11" size may also be used.

Volumes I, II, III, and IV shall be submitted in separate three-ring binders. Diagrams, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs may be reduced and, if necessary, run landscape or folded to eliminate oversize pages. Text in Diagrams, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall be no smaller than 10 point. Diagrams, tables, artwork, and photographs shall not be used to circumvent the text size limitations of the proposal.

(3) Title pages, tabs, and tables of contents are excluded from the page counts specified in paragraph (1) of this provision (as well as other documents specified in table (b)(1) above). In addition, the Cost volume of your proposal is not page limited ***except for the page limit for the Basis of Estimate (BOE) section specified in table (b)(1) above***. However, this volume is to be strictly limited to cost and price information. Information that can be construed as belonging in one of the other volumes of the proposal will be so construed and counted against that volume's page limitation.

(4) The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award contract(s) without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the offeror's initial proposal should contain the offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. If discussions are held and final proposal revisions are requested, the Government will specify separate page limitations in its request for that submission.

(5) Pages submitted in excess of the limitations specified in this provision will not be evaluated by the Government and will be returned to the offeror in accordance with NFS 1815.204-70(b).

(End of provision)

L.14 OFFER VOLUME

This must be a separate volume.

(a) STANDARD FORM (SF) 33, OFFEROR FILL INS AND SECTION K

Blocks 12 through 18 of the SF 33 and the indicated Offeror required fill-ins in Sections B-K must be completed. The signed SF33 and the pages with the required fill-ins must be submitted. Annual representations and certifications shall be completed electronically in accordance with provision K.1, Annual Representations and Certifications (52.204-8). The balance of the solicitation need not be returned unless the Offeror has made changes to other pages that will

constitute part of the contract. Any such changes must be separately identified in the Summary of Exceptions. **All SF 33s require original signatures.**

(1) It is requested that Offerors indicate, in Block 12 of the SF 33, a proposal validity period of 180 days. However, in accordance with paragraph (d) of FAR provision 52.215-1, "Instructions to Offerors--Competitive Acquisitions", a different validity period may be proposed by the Offeror.

(2) Provide the names and phone numbers of persons to be contacted for clarification of questions of a technical nature and business nature. Identify any consultants and/or subcontractors used in writing this proposal (if any) and the extent to which their services will be available in the subsequent performance of this effort.

The contract schedule refers to TBD and TBP. They are defined as follows:

TBD = TO BE DETERMINED BY THE GOVERNMENT

TBP = TO BE PROPOSED BY THE CONTRACTOR

(b) *SUMMARY OF EXCEPTIONS*

Include a statement of acceptance of the anticipated contract provisions and proposed contract schedule, or list all specific exceptions to the terms, conditions, and requirements of Sections A through J of this solicitation, to the Representations and Certifications (Section K) or to the information requested in Section L. Include the reason for the exception, or refer to where the reason is addressed in the proposal. This list must include all exceptions, both "business" and "technical".

Include any new terms, conditions or clauses proposed by the Offeror which are of benefit to the Government. Discuss the benefit to the Government in Volume I, II, III, or IV as appropriate.

Offerors are cautioned that exceptions or new terms, conditions, or clauses may result in a determination of proposal unacceptability (NFS 1815.305-70), may preclude award to an Offeror if award is made without discussions, or may otherwise affect an Offeror's competitive standing.

(c) *ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED*

(1) Business Systems

State whether all business systems, including but not limited to accounting, property control, purchasing, estimating, and employee compensation, which require Government acceptance or approval (as applicable) are currently accepted/approved without condition.

Provide the date of acceptance/approval for each system and the cognizant contract administration office. Explain any existing conditional acceptances/approvals and the compliance status of any systems(s) for which acceptance or approval is currently withheld.

FAR 16.301-3 requires that a contractor's accounting system be adequate for determining costs applicable to the contract prior to the award of a cost-reimbursement contract. The offeror shall provide evidence of an adequate accounting system as determined by the cognizant administrative office for accumulating and reporting incurred costs. An adequate accounting system is not an evaluation criterion. It is a basic contract requirement with a pass/fail determination. A contract may only be awarded to the offeror(s) who are determined to have an adequate accounting system.

(2) Responsibility Information

Provide information addressing all of the elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility (address the elements under this section that are not addressed in another proposal volume).

(3) Taxpayer Identification Number

Prime offerors shall provide their Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) (the number required by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) to be used by the offeror in reporting income tax and other returns).

(4) Government Property

Section L of this solicitation contains NASA FAR Supplement provisions 1852.245-80, "Government Property Management Information" and 1852.245-81, "List of Available Government Property." The first provision requires the submittal of certain information regarding the Offeror's Government property management procedures. The second provision requires the Offeror's to indicate if they intend to use any Government property that may be offered by this solicitation or if the Offeror requests the use of Government property not identified by this solicitation. This information should be included in this volume.

(5) Waiver of Rights to Inventions

This solicitation contains NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) clause 1852.227-70, "New Technology" and NFS provision 1852.227-71, "Request for Waiver to Rights to Inventions". Any petitions for advance (prior to contract execution) waiver of rights to inventions should be included in this volume.

(6) Cost Accounting Standards

State whether the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement represented in Provision K.2, Cost Accounting Standards Notices and Certifications, has been approved

by the cognizant Administrative Contracting Officer, and provide the date of such approval. If your CAS Disclosure Statement is currently not approved or there are some existing CAS non-compliance findings, please provide detailed explanation of the CAS non-compliance issues, corrective action status, and any potential impact on this procurement.

(7) Subcontractor Listing

The Offeror shall provide a summary listing (by name and address) of all subcontractors (regardless of dollar value) that have been identified throughout the Offeror's proposal and the subcontract cost associated with each entity.

(8) Other Information to be Provided

Provide a copy of a SBA approved joint venture agreement compliant with 13 CFR 124.513, if applicable.

In accordance with NFS 1852.237-72, Access of Sensitive Information, Offerors shall provide a preliminary analysis of possible organizational conflicts of interest that might flow from the award of this contract. Within 30 days after contract award, the successful contractor shall submit for NASA approval a comprehensive Organizational Conflicts of Interest Avoidance Plan. This comprehensive plan shall incorporate any previous studies performed, shall thoroughly analyze all organizational conflicts of interest that might arise because the Contractor has access to other companies' sensitive information, and shall establish specific methods to control, mitigate, or eliminate all problems identified. The Contracting Officer, with advice from Center Legal Counsel, shall review the plan for completeness and identify to the Contractor substantive weaknesses and omissions for necessary correction. Once the Contractor has corrected the substantive weaknesses and omissions, the Contracting Officer shall incorporate the approved plan into the contract, as a compliance document.

(End of Provision)

L.15 MISSION SUITABILITY PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS (COMPETITIVE)

Contents of Mission Suitability Proposal Instructions

1. General Instructions
2. Mission Suitability Proposal Format
3. Mission Suitability Instructions by Subfactor
4. Offeror Deviations/Exceptions

1. General Instructions

The Mission Suitability Proposal should be specific, detailed, and provide all the information requested by these instructions. The Mission Suitability Proposal must demonstrate that the offeror understands the requirements and has the ability to meet the requirements. General statements such as the "requirements are understood" or "standard procedures will be employed" are not adequate. Also, restatement or paraphrasing of the requirements should be avoided. Information previously submitted, if any, will not be considered unless it is resubmitted as part of the proposal. It must not be incorporated by reference.

The offeror must identify and discuss the risk factors associated with accomplishment of the requirements of the contemplated contract. This must be done as appropriate in the Mission Suitability Proposal. Risk factors may be those inherent in the work, unique to the offeror's chosen approach, and must include any risk factors that are specifically identified by the Government in this solicitation. General areas of possible risk that are of concern to NASA are technical, schedule, cost, safety, occupational health, security (including personnel, information technology), export control and environmental risks. The identification of risks is the responsibility of the offeror. However, these instructions may include Government identified risks that the offeror must also address. The offeror's discussion of a risk factor should provide the offeror's approach to managing the risk--the probability of the risk, impact and severity, time frame and risk acceptance or mitigation.

2. Mission Suitability Proposal Format

The Mission Suitability Proposal must be divided and presented by each Mission Suitability subfactor as follows:

Subfactor A—Understanding the Key Requirements of the Statement of Work & Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTO)

Subfactor B—Management Approach

Subfactor C—Small Business Utilization

3. Mission Suitability Instructions by Subfactor

Subfactor A—Understanding the Key Requirements of the Statement of Work & Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTO)

The offeror shall describe their technical approach for the limited areas of the Statement of Work (SOW) as follows: 1.1 Earth Gravity Field; 1.2 Planetary Gravity Modeling; 1.3 Non-Conservative Force Modeling; 1.5 Terrestrial Reference Frame; 1.6 Time-Variable Gravity; 1.7 Geophysical Fluids Influences on Global Geodynamics; 1.8 Sea Level and Tides; 1.10 Geomagnetic Infrastructure Support; 2.1 ICESat Science Standard Data Products; 2.2 Radar Altimeter Performance Analysis; 2.4 Polar Ice Science Using Altimetry; 2.5 ICESat/GLAS/CRYoSat; 2.6 Ice Penetrating Radar; 2.7 Ice Sheet Satellite Data Analysis; 2.9 Digital Topography Assessment and Analysis; 2.11 Altimetry of Inland Water Bodies; 2.12 Remote Sensing Instrument Development; 3.1 GEODYN; 3.3 Analysis Software; 3.5 Software Development of Ranging, Altimeter and Transponder Experiments and Information Technology (IT) Support to Goddard's Geophysical and Astronomical Observatory (GGAO); and 3.7 ICESAT-2/ATLAS Flight Algorithm Development Support.

The offeror shall provide enough detail to clearly and fully demonstrate that the Offeror understands the requirements and the inherent challenges associated with the objectives of the

procurement. The offeror shall identify all of the potential risks under this contract and also describe the risk management techniques that will be used to manage identified risks during contract performance.

The Offeror's technical approach shall demonstrate an understanding of the requirements and provide the techniques and procedures that will be used to satisfy the requirements.

The offeror shall describe the key scientific principles underlying the advanced work described in the functions of SOW listed above.

Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTO)

THE OFFEROR IS NOT TO PERFORM ANY ACTUAL WORK OR PRODUCE ANY DELIVERABLES ON THE REPRESENTATIVE TASK ORDERS IN RESPONSE TO THE RFP.

The following applies to both RTO 1 and RTO 2.

The representative task orders (RTOs) included in Exhibit A & B of the RFP are to help us understand how you, as our contractor, would perform the representative tasks associated with the SOW.

The offeror shall describe its approach to implementing and staffing each task order. The response must be specific, detailed, and complete enough to demonstrate your understanding of the technical objectives and challenges in accomplishing the task order requirements. Each response to the representative task orders shall include a proposed Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and must address the following: The technical approach for the specific requirements of the task; Labor categories and projected hours; The schedule for completing the effort, including key milestones and the flow of activities from start to completion; Staffing plan consistent with technical approach, government interface, objectives and schedule; Other resources such as facilities and equipment, necessary to successfully accomplish the task. Identification of and response to potential technical problems and critical issues, including risk identification and mitigation. Any assumptions made in preparing a response to the RTOs must be clearly stated.

The offeror shall complete Exhibit C-3 chart/table of proposed staffing for the RTOs, per labor category, which matches the proposed qualifications requirements of the management plan, and identifies who is available from the prime contractor or any team member (s).

The offeror shall describe any new or innovative methods, techniques or technologies proposed. The offeror shall fully describe each method, technique or technology and explain how they impact the performance of the RTO under the proposed contract. Efficiencies should be quantified where possible. All discussions must be clear and concise and refer to the appropriate

RTO activity.

The following applies to RTO 1 only.

The offeror shall describe the principles of physical science, engineering, information science, and/or mathematics underlying both the work described and the methods used to perform the work and citations to the literature to efficiently establish this background.

The offeror shall demonstrate expertise and familiarity with the Orbit Determination and Geodetic Parameter Estimation software known as GEODYN (latest versions), the Error Analysis software known as ORAN and ERODYN, and the software to manipulate, combine, and invert the normal equations to test parameter sensitivity and determine least squares solutions known as SOLVE. The offeror shall demonstrate the capability to modify and extend the capability of these software packages.

The offeror shall demonstrate an understanding of state-of-the-art precision orbit determination for low Earth Orbiters, in particular altimeter satellites used to measure global ocean topography or ice sheet topography.

The following applies to RTO 2 only.

The offeror shall demonstrate expertise and familiarity with the four major space geodesy data types (Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS), laser ranging, Very Long Baseline Interferometry (VLBI), and Doppler Orbitography and Radiopositioning Integrated by Satellite (DORIS), their derived products, and their respective International Association of Geodesy (IAG) services including Global Geodetic Observing System (GGOS). This expertise should include familiarity with current data formats and plans for future developments.

The offeror shall demonstrate expertise and familiarity with database management systems (MySQL version 5 or later), and metadata standards, citing appropriate standards for management of data systems within the Solar Systems Exploration division, in particular in support of space geodetic data, products and information. The offeror shall demonstrate the capability to modify and extend the metadata standards to such a data system's implementation, including coordinating with Earth Observation System Data and Information System/Global Change Master Directory (EOSDIS/GCMD) requirements.

The offeror shall demonstrate expertise and familiarity with programming/scripting languages and methodologies used for data archiving, including metadata extraction, web-based data discovery methods, and web development technology.

Subfactor B-- Management Approach

The Management Plan shall describe the organizational structure, policies, procedures, and techniques for efficiently managing the proposed work at the contract level. The proposal shall discuss the interrelationships of technical management, business management, and subcontract management to be employed to assure cost effectiveness. The processes and procedures for configuration management, performance assurance, and overall work planning and reporting shall be addressed.

If subcontractors are proposed, provide: 1) the basis for selection of subcontractor, 2) the nature and extent of the work to be performed by the subcontractor, including functional areas and functional split of responsibilities including the potential percentages of work to be performed, 3) the methods of management and reporting to GSFC of subcontractors' financial and technical plans and performance, and 4) a separate organization chart for each subcontractor.

The offeror shall describe their plan for staffing a qualified workforce in order to meet contract needs in a timely manner. This shall include a discussion of the personnel categories proposed under the contract and how the labor skill and mix will be employed to accomplish the work. The offeror's plan shall include any necessary staffing support to perform under the resultant contract, respond to critical requirements, and staff new requirements from existing resources and from outside sources. A staffing plan must be submitted for the phase-in plan.

Corporate resources are to be defined in terms of staffing, corporate support, facilities and equipment, and applicable tools that are available and required for supporting the performance of work on the contract. Offeror's shall address the availability of funding and other financial resources available for this effort. If the Offeror proposes to use any tools in managing the contract, describe the capabilities and intended use of the tools and describe where and how these tools are being used currently.

Offerors shall provide written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement. Offerors need to address the minimum requirements in the position qualifications, to include the necessary experience, summary of duties and responsibilities, specific requirements/licensing, minimum education and minimum experience required for the position. All position qualifications will be incorporated into the resultant contract as Attachment B.

Phase-In Plan – (The government anticipates upon contract award, phase-in to be the first task order issued).

The offeror shall provide a detailed phase-in plan that addresses, at a minimum, the offeror's approach to phase-in sufficient to ensure continuity and a smooth transition with the incumbent Contractor during the 30-day phase-in period. The phase-in plan shall clearly demonstrate an ability to assume full contract responsibility on the effective date of the contract. The phase-in plan shall also specifically address how ongoing work will be maintained, the proposed management organization, schedule, orientation and training of personnel. If the effort involves onsite performance, the offeror shall address their preparation for the timely processing of the Personal Identify Verification (PIV) requirements. If the phase-in plan assumes any dependency upon the incumbent contractor, please identify. Also, specify the extent of involvement of NASA personnel during this period. The offeror shall provide a staffing plan for the phase-in effort. The 30-day phase-in period will be accomplished through the ordering period of this contract.

Quality Assurance Plan

The offeror shall submit a written Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) that shall identify the offeror's approach to ensuring quality services throughout the duration of the contract. Specifically, the offeror shall identify in the plan the procedure for continually monitoring, surveilling, identifying and correcting deficiencies. The QAP shall describe the offeror's method (i.e. 100% inspection, planned sampling, random sampling, customer complaints, or incidental inspections) to determine whether performance requirements in the SOW are met. The QAP shall describe whether measurements of performance are subjective or objective and shall identify the quality, quantity, and timeliness of the services to be provided. The QAP will be incorporated into the contract as an Attachment.

Total Compensation Plan

The offeror shall provide a Total Compensation Plan (TCP) for all personnel proposed, in accordance with NFS provision 1852.231-71, entitled Determination of Compensation Reasonableness, and FAR provision 52.222-46, entitled Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees. The required TCP must:

- 1) Classify all labor categories proposed as "exempt" or "non-exempt" positions. Briefly define the terms "exempt" and "non-exempt" as used by your organization and correlate your definition with that provided for in the Code of Federal Regulations.
- 2) Identify the categories of personnel that are in a bona fide executive, administrative or professional capacity as defined by FAR 22.1102 and 29 CFR 541.
- 3) In accordance with the Exhibit C14A & C14B "Fringe Benefit Chart", the offeror and all service subcontractors (as defined in paragraph (d) of NFS provision 1852.231-71) shall provide

a detailed list of their fringe benefits and company estimated cost per hour, along with an itemization of the benefits that require employee contributions and the amount of that contribution as a percentage of the total cost of the benefit. Two exhibits shall be submitted, one containing the average of fringe benefit information for all the exempt labor categories and one containing the average of fringe benefit information for all the non-exempt labor categories. (The Mission Suitability proposal must not include Exhibit C14A & C14B but should reference where the information appears in the cost proposal.)

4) Provide supporting data, such as recognized national, regional, and local compensation surveys and studies of professional, public and private organizations, used in establishing the total professional compensation structure. If your approach includes incumbent capture, please address any unique aspects of that within your compensation plan.

Mentor-Protégé Program

The NASA Mentor-Protégé Program is designed to incentivize NASA prime contractors to assist small disadvantaged business (SDB) concerns, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), minority institutions (MIs), and women-owned small business (WOSB) concerns in enhancing their capabilities to perform NASA contracts and subcontracts, foster the establishment of long-term business relationships between these entities and NASA prime contractors, and increase the overall number of these entities that receive NASA contract and subcontract awards. Provide a description of the prime's planned participation in the NASA Mentor Protégé Program. Provide details on past experiences in the Mentor-Protégé Program.

Safety and Health Plan

The offeror shall provide a safety and health plan in accordance with NFS Provision 1852.223-73, entitled "Safety and Health Plan". The offeror shall discuss its approach to compliance with all applicable NASA policies and procedures relative to safety, occupational health, and NASA Procedural Requirements (NPR) 8715.3 "NASA General Safety Program Requirements." This plan, as approved by the Government, will be included in any resulting contract. The plan shall include a detailed discussion of the policies, procedures, and techniques that will be used to ensure the safety and occupational health of all working conditions throughout the performance of the contract. Offerors are directed to NPR 8715.3, Appendix E instructions regarding the contents of Safety and Health Plan. NPR 8715.3 can be accessed at the following website: <http://nodis3.gsfc.nasa.gov/displayDir.cfm?t=NPR&c=8715&s=3C>. The offeror shall include all required contents of the Safety and Health Plan in accordance with NPR 8715.3. The offeror shall discuss its past safety record and accident history.

The offeror shall indicate if any of the standard contents of the Safety and Health Plan, as prescribed by NPR 8715.3, are not applicable to this specific contract, and provide an explanation for that determination.

The offeror's plan shall address their approach to handling the hazardous materials identified in Clause I.4, Hazardous Material Identification and Material Safety Data (FAR 52.223-3 Alternate I), if applicable.

Subfactor C – Small Business Utilization

All offerors, except small businesses, must complete the portion of the instructions under Small Business Subcontracting specific to Small Business Subcontracting Plans. Small businesses are not required to submit Small Business Subcontracting Plans; however, small businesses are required to indicate the amount of effort proposed to be done by a small business either at the prime level or at the first tier subcontract level.

All Offeror's are required to complete the instructions regarding the Commitment to Small Businesses.

The instructions regarding SDB participation apply to all offers.

(a) Small Business Subcontracting

Small Business Subcontracting Plan (the Plan) Required by the FAR:

(1) This solicitation contains FAR clause 52.219-9, "Small Business Subcontracting Plan and its Alternate II". The Plan described and required by the clause, including the associated subcontracting percentage goals and subcontracting dollars, shall be submitted with your proposal.

(2) The Contracting Officer's assessment of appropriate subcontracting goals for this acquisition, expressed as a percent of the IDIQ MAXIMUM ORDERING VALUE, is as follows:

Small Businesses (SB)	20%
*Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns (SDB) (Includes SDBs in both targeted and non-targeted areas.)	6.0%
Women Owned Small Business Concerns (WOSB)	4.5%
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU)	0.5%
HUBZone Small Business Concerns (HBZ)	3.0%
Veteran Owned Small Business Concerns (VOSB)	1.5%
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns (SDVOSB)	1.0%

*Although 15 U.S.C. 637(d) requires subcontracting plans to contain information about SDB concerns, case law prevents the Government from giving evaluation credit to business types based on race or ethnicity unless those businesses are in under represented industries. The Section M evaluation for SDB participation ensures that the Government only evaluates participation of SDBs in industries that are designated by the Department of Commerce as underrepresented. For purposes of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan, the proposed subcontracting goal for SDBs will be evaluated based upon the SDB's status as a small business.

(3) The numbers above reflect the Contracting Officer's assessment of the appropriate subcontracting goals to be achieved at the conclusion of the award. When appropriate, an offeror may discuss plans to phase-in small business concerns, explaining the rationale for the phase-in schedule. For purposes of evaluation, the Government will evaluate the proposed subcontracting goals at the conclusion of the contract; any phase-in goals will be used as part of an award fee determination to the extent award fee evaluations are included in the resulting contract.

(4) Offerors are encouraged to propose goals that are equivalent to or greater than those recommended by the Contracting Officer. However, offerors must perform an independent assessment of the small business subcontracting opportunities and are encouraged to propose goals exceeding the recommended goals where practical.

(5) The Plan submitted with the proposal shall be incorporated in Section J as Attachment D in the resulting contract. The requirements in the Plan must flow down to first tier large business subcontracts expected to exceed \$550,000 or \$1,000,000 for construction of a public facility. Although these first tier large business subcontractors are encouraged to meet or exceed the stated goals, it is recognized that the subcontracting opportunities available to these subcontractors may differ from those suggested in the solicitation based upon the nature of their respective performance requirements.

(6) Offerors are advised that a proposal will not be rejected solely because the submitted Plan does not meet the NASA recommended goals that are expressed in paragraph a) (2) above in terms of percent of the IDIQ MAXIMUM ORDERING VALUE. NASA will consider the amount of work being retained for performance by the prime contractor in-house when determining whether a subcontracting plan is acceptable. Offerors shall discuss the rationale for any goal proposed that is less than the Contracting Officer's recommended goal in any category. In addition, the Offeror shall describe the efforts made to establish a goal for that category and what ongoing efforts, if any, the Offeror plans during performance to increase participation in that category.

(7) In addition to submitting a Small Business Subcontracting Plan in accordance with the Section I FAR clause 52.219-9, Alternate II, offeror's shall complete Exhibit 13, SMALL

BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN GOALS, which provides a breakdown of the offeror's proposed goals, by small business category, expressed in terms of both a percent of the IDIQ MAXIMUM ORDERING VALUE and a percent of TOTAL PLANNED SUBCONTRACTS. Offerors shall show the proposed subcontracting goals for the basic contract requirement and each option separately.

(NOTE: FOR PURPOSES OF THE SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN, THE PROPOSED GOALS SHALL BE STATED AS A **PERCENT OF TOTAL SUBCONTRACTS**, NOT AS A PERCENT OF THE IDIQ MAXIMUM ORDERING VALUE , REFER TO THE BELOW EXAMPLE)

Example of Subcontracting Goals as expressed in both the IDIQ Maximum Ordering Value and Subcontract Value for a IDIQ maximum ordering value of \$100M and estimated subcontracts of \$50M.

	<i>Column A</i>	<i>Column B</i>	<i>Column C</i>
Category	Percent of IDIQ Maximum Value	Dollar Value	Percent of Subcontracting Value
Small Business Concerns	25 percent	\$25,000,000	50 percent
<i>The following subcategories are inclusive of the above Small Business percentage</i>			
Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns	5.5 percent	\$5,500,000	11 percent
Women Owned Small Business Concerns	9 percent	\$9,000,000	18 percent
Historically Black Colleges and Universities	1.5 percent	\$1,500,000	3 percent
HUBZone Small Business Concerns	1.5 percent	\$1,500,000	3 percent
Veteran Owned Small Business Concerns	2.5 percent	\$2,500,000	5 percent
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns	1.5 percent	\$1,500,000	3 percent

The Offeror proposes small business subcontracting goals as a percentage of the IDIQ Maximum Ordering Value in column A.

Then based on the \$100 million IDIQ Maximum Ordering Value, the resulting statement of dollars that the Offeror would include in the Subcontracting Plan, as required by paragraph (d)(2) of FAR clause 52.219-9, would be as indicated in column B.

However, the Small Business Subcontracting Plan shall also express goals as a percent of total planned subcontracts. Assuming total subcontracting of \$50M, the resulting percentage goals, expressed as a percent of total subcontract dollars, and which would be stated in the Small Business Subcontracting Plan as required by paragraph (d)(1) FAR clause 52.219-9 would be recorded in column C.

(b) Commitment to the Small Business Program

(1) All Offerors must briefly describe work that will be performed by small businesses. Information could also include the identification of any work to be subcontracted considered “high technology.”

(2) If the subcontractor(s) is known, offerors must connect the work to the subcontractor and specify the extent of commitment to use the subcontractor (s) (enforceable vs. non-enforceable commitments). (Small business offerors shall provide this information to the extent subcontracting opportunities exist in their approach to performing the requirement.)

(3) All Offerors shall provide information demonstrating the extent of commitment to utilize small business concerns and to support their development. Information provided should include a brief description of established or planned procedures and organizational structure for Small Business outreach, assistance, participation in the Mentor Protégé program, counseling, market research and Small Business identification, and relevant purchasing procedures. (For Large Business Offerors, this information should conform to applicable portions of your submitted Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Small Business Offerors shall provide this information to the extent subcontracting opportunities exist in their approach to performing the requirement.)

Small Disadvantage Business (SDB) Participation

(a) Small Disadvantaged Business Participation – Contract Targets:

(1) The targets **only** include subcontracts with SDB concerns in those industries designated by the Department of Commerce as underrepresented areas by NAICS Industry Subsector. The General Services Administration has posted this Department of Commerce determination at <http://www.arnet.gov/References/sdbadjustments.htm>.

(2) After completing an independent assessment of the opportunities available for subcontracting with targeted small disadvantaged firms, Offerors shall propose a target for SDB participation by completing the Section H clause at H.10 TBD, *Small Disadvantaged Business*

Participation – Contract Targets. The target for SDB participation in clause H.10 TBD shall be expressed as a percent of the IDIQ Maximum Ordering Value.

For additional information on underrepresented areas by NAICS Industry Subsectors, Offerors may reference the following website:

<http://www.arnet.gov/References/sdbadjustments.htm>.

4. Deviations\Exceptions (Mission Suitability Proposal)

Identify and explain the reason for any deviations, exceptions, or conditional assumptions taken with respect to these Mission Suitability Proposal instructions or to any of the technical requirements of this solicitation, such as the SOW and related specifications.

(End of text)

L.16 COST VOLUME

The Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) requires Contracting Officers to purchase supplies and services from responsible sources at fair and reasonable prices. It is expected that adequate price competition will be obtained under this solicitation so that submission of cost or pricing data is not required pursuant to FAR 52.215-20, Requirements for Cost or Pricing Data or Information Other Than Cost or Pricing Data--Alternate IV. The term “other than cost or pricing data” is defined at FAR 15.402.

1. Instructions

An important prerequisite for the award of the contract is the prime offerors must have an accounting system that has been determined adequate by the cognizant administrative office for accumulating and reporting incurred costs prior to contract award. While these proposals are not required to be cost certified, they are to be in sufficient detail to allow direct and indirect rate verification and audit of selected costs by cognizant Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) offices. The cost proposal should be prepared in a manner consistent with your current accounting system.

The required format for other than cost or pricing data is for evaluation purposes. The cost for any resultant contract will be awarded on the basis of the successful Offeror's normal estimating and/or accounting system or the system set forth in the Cost Accounting Standards Board Disclosure Statement required by Public Law 100-679, if applicable. If the Offeror's estimating and/or accounting practice differs from the required cost proposal format, the costs should be computed in accordance with the Offeror's normal accounting and estimating procedures; Offeror shall provide the rationale for the format adjustments.

Direct labor must be estimated on the basis of productive effort. Productive effort is the estimated number of hours required to perform the work. Vacations, holidays, sick leave, and any other paid absences shall not be cited as direct labor, but shall be separately identified and priced or included in indirect cost.

Final monetary extensions in the cost proposal may be expressed as the closest whole dollar amount, with cents omitted.

Duty charges, if any shall be included in the cost, regardless of whether or not duty free certificates are obtained.

A "subcontract" is any contract, purchase order, material order, interorganizational transfer, etc. that is a direct cost to this acquisition. The Offeror shall provide sufficient detail to support and explain all costs proposed. For significant subcontracts that exceeds 20% of the proposed Representative Task Order (RTO) estimate, the proposed subcontractor shall provide the same cost exhibits and supporting information that is requested from the prime Offeror. Prospective significant subcontractors may submit proprietary cost data under separate cover directly to the Government no later than the date and time specified in the instructions for receipt of offers for this RFP.

The Offeror shall submit electronic copies of the cost proposal charts contained in the referenced Exhibits in Microsoft Excel format on CD-ROMs. Two copies of the CD-ROMs shall be submitted with one copy identified as the backup. This requirement is in addition to the required hard copies. The Offeror shall include all formulas in the cost charts to substantiate the whole dollar amount proposed. The Offeror shall certify that all disks are virus-free. In the event of any inconsistency between data provided on electronic media and hard copies, the hard copy data will be considered to be correct.

Offerors, including proposed significant subcontractors, shall submit one copy of their cost proposal directly to your cognizant DCAA auditing office by the due date specified on the solicitation face page, Standard Form 33, Block 9. The name, mailing address, email address, and phone number of the cognizant DCAA office are to be included in the written narrative of the Offer Volume. Please ensure that all contact information provided is current and correct.

All pricing and estimating techniques shall be clearly explained in detail (projections, rates, ratios, percentages, factors, etc.) and shall support the proposed costs in such a manner that audit,

computation, and verification can be accomplished. Also, any experience factors (unit prices, hours, quantities, etc.) and judgmental projections shall be explained. All past actuals shall show the periods of time and costs in detail when used as a basis for estimating the proposed costs.

The escalation proposed for labor must be stated along with the actual escalation experienced in the last three years. Provide a statement of rationale, including the derivation, for the proposed escalation rates. If escalation is not proposed, explain why. The Offeror shall also discuss the rationale for any escalation proposed for the other cost elements. The Offeror shall also include the company's escalation history for each other cost element experienced in the past three years.

The Government does not intend to issue a separate task order for overall contract program management. Accordingly, in accordance with the Offeror's approved accounting system, the Offeror shall clearly indicate how program management costs will be captured and charged. Program management costs must be included in the RTO cost estimates in accordance with the instructions in Section 2 below.

The Offeror shall clearly identify and list any cost items that will be routinely direct charged as an Other Direct Cost in all task orders. The supporting rationale associated with these proposed ODC expenses shall also be submitted.

In order to establish the reasonableness and realism of the proposed costs, and the extent to which costs reflect performance addressed in the Mission Suitability Proposal, each Offeror, including proposed significant subcontractors, shall submit the other than cost or pricing data described in paragraph 2 below.

2. Cost Proposal Format

a. DIRECT LABOR AND INDIRECT RATES MATRIX

Offerors shall complete **Attachment B**, Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates, and Fixed Fee Matrices, for each contract year. The direct labor and indirect rates are "not to exceed" bid rates. During contract performance, Offerors will be permitted to offer costs for task orders to be placed at lower rates than are listed in these matrix in accordance with the "TASK ORDERING PROCEDURE" and "SUPPLEMENTAL TASK ORDERING PROCEDURES" clauses of this contract. The labor categories proposed must reflect all labor categories and levels within each category anticipated to perform the requirements of the Statement of Work and Representative Task Orders and should range from entry level to the most senior level.

In **Attachment B**, the prime Offeror shall propose unburdened direct labor rates for all labor categories in Section 1 and all individual bid indirect rates in Section 2, clearly delineating on-site and off-site rates. The Offeror's fee rate included in Section 3 of the matrix shall be used to calculate the fixed fee for performing all task orders issued under the resultant contract. In Section 4, the Offeror shall include a fully-loaded direct labor rate matrix for each significant subcontractor those who are expected to exceed **20%** of a proposed RTO estimate. In Section 5, provide Position Descriptions for all Offeror proposed direct labor categories specified in Section 1 and all significant subcontractor proposed direct labor categories specified in Section 4.

b. SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED COST AND FIXED FEE

Offerors shall complete **Exhibit C-1**. Exhibit C-1 summarizes the estimated cost and fixed fee for two Representative Task Orders based on bid labor and bid indirect burden rates.

c. REPRESENTATIVE TASK ORDER (RTO) COSTS

Offeror shall complete **Exhibits C-2, C-2A, and C-2B** for each of the Representative Task Orders. Complete **Exhibit C-2** for each RTO showing all costs (direct labor, indirect costs, ODCs, and fee) by contract year associated with performing the RTO. Complete **Exhibit C-2A** for all contract years for each RTO. The Offeror shall include all costs (direct labor, indirect costs, ODCs, and fee) associated with performing the RTO. Offerors shall use the "not to exceed" bid rates proposed in **Attachment B** for pricing all RTOs.

In addition to the summary cost proposal exhibits for each RTO, Offerors shall provide detailed back-up cost spreadsheets that include the following elements by month:

- Prime and, if proposed, significant subcontractor(s) labor, including labor hours, rates, and categories for personnel, for both onsite and offsite personnel (**Exhibit C-2B**);
- Contract Program Management and Administrative Support costs: include and identify;
- Indirect labor burden(s) (i.e. Overhead and Fringe Benefits (if separate pool)), for both

onsite and offsite;

- Other Direct Costs (ODCs), include detailed breakout of materials, travel, computer services, subcontracts, and other direct costs;
- General & Administrative burden(s);
- Fixed Fee.

d. RTO SOURCE OF PERSONNEL

Offeror shall complete **Exhibit C-3** to show the offeror's plans to obtain the required personnel for each RTO at the overall RTO task level. The offeror shall show the total number of staff proposed for each position, how many are available from within the company, and how many will be newly hired for the first RTO contract year.

e. BASIS OF ESTIMATES (BOE)

The BOEs are for the Representative Task Orders only. Each RTO cost proposal shall include a separate narrative BOE section. The Offerors shall give the Government insight into the cost estimating thought processes and methodologies used by the Offeror in estimating the quantities of labor hours/costs, other direct costs, etc. required for successful performance of each RTO at the WBS Level 2. Emphasis should be placed on a description of the cost estimating processes and methodologies themselves, and how these relate to the technical approach described in the proposal. The information provided under this section, along with audit information, will be used to assess the cost realism aspect of Mission Suitability.

At a minimum, include the following information in the BOE in the format that is most convenient, preferably the format which shall be used for the actual contract performance:

- Narrative explaining how you arrived at your estimate of labor hours, including: if your estimate was based on similar comparable program(s), identify and provide a brief reason why the programs are similar; if your estimate was based on a standard, identify the standard and explain if it is from the industry, your company, or a product; or, if your

estimate was based on engineering judgment, explain the philosophies used.

- Explain in detail how your Program Management and Administrative Support are charged: if direct, explain the estimating approach and assumptions (hours per year, percentage of direct labor hours or costs, etc.); if indirect, identify what pool each function is included.
- Use of any established cost-estimating relationships.
- How significant subcontracts were estimated. Also identify any experience you have with the proposed subcontractor(s), if utilized.
- An explanation of how all materials, computer services, travel, equipment, and other direct costs were estimated.

BOEs shall be submitted by both the Prime Offeror and all proposed subcontractors and shall comply with the BOE page limitations set forth in PROPOSAL PREPARATIONS—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS provision of this RFP.

f. Exhibit C-4 - Reserved

g. CONTRACTOR FISCAL YEAR TO CONTRACT YEAR RATE CONVERSION EXHIBIT

Exhibit C-5 summarizes the Offeror's **bid** rates for Overhead, G&A, and any "Other" indirect rate that the Offeror proposes. These rates are to be proposed in accordance with their Contractor Fiscal Year and approved accounting system. Please note that the Contract Year Composite indirect rates shall match the rates proposed in **Section 2, Attachment B, Direct Labor and Indirect Rates Matrix**.

h. SUMMARY OF RECURRING OTHER DIRECT COSTS (ODCs)

Offerors shall complete **Exhibit C-6** for any recurring ODCs (e.g. computer usage, program management, depreciation, administrative support, etc.) routinely bid on an established cost estimating relationship in accordance with your approved accounting system. In this exhibit, the Offerors shall show the percentage, rate, and/or dollar amount used, as well as, a detailed explanation of the basis of application and estimating approaches and assumptions.

If all recurring ODCs are included in your indirect expenses, do not remove them from your indirect pools and include them in this exhibit.

If you do not have any established CERs, insert “NONE” in this exhibit.

i. MATERIAL BY RTO

Offerors shall complete **Exhibit C-7** for each RTO detailing the proposed material items and costs by contract year at the WBS Level 2.

j. EQUIPMENT BY RTO

A plug-in number shall be inserted in all proposals for equipment for RTO's 1 and 2 in the amount of \$7,500 for Year 1, \$7,725 for Year 2, \$7,957 for Year 3, and \$8,195 for Year 4, total of \$31,377 for all 4 years as stated in **Exhibit C-8**.

k. TRAVEL BY RTO

Offerors shall complete **Exhibit C-9** for each RTO detailing the proposed travel costs by contract year at the WBS Level 2.

l. OTHER DIRECT COSTS (ODCs) BY RTO

Offerors shall complete **Exhibit C-10** for each RTO detailing the proposed other direct cost items and costs by contract year, including details for Program Management and Administrative Support.

m. PROBABLE SUBCONTRACTS

Offerors shall complete **Exhibit C-11** summarizing by RTO the activities that the Offeror proposes to subcontract.

n. PHASE-IN PLAN

Offerors shall propose for a 30-day period Phase-In, which will be performed under the awarded contract. **Exhibit C-12A & C-12B** shall be used to state the proposed cost for the phase-in, which is expected to commence on or about May 2, 2011. The cost for phase-in is included in Subfactor C, Management Plan.

o. PRODUCTIVE WORK YEAR CALCULATIONS

Exhibit C-13 summarizes the Offeror's productive work year and how it is calculated. If exempt and non-exempt employees are proposed, separate exhibits must be provided for each classification. Submit multiple Exhibit(s) C-13 labeled as "Exempt" or "Non-Exempt" as required.

p. FRINGE BENEFITS EXHIBITS

As addressed in the Mission Suitability Proposal instructions (Subfactor L.15), the Offeror and all service subcontractors (as defined in paragraph (d) of NFS provision 1852.231-71) shall

provide a Total Compensation Plan. The prime and significant subcontractors shall also submit **Exhibit C-14A and C-14B**, Fringe Benefit Chart. Two exhibits shall be submitted, one containing the average of fringe benefit information for all the exempt labor categories and one containing the average of fringe benefit information for all the non-exempt labor categories. Non-significant subcontractors shall not complete Exhibit C-14A and C-14B, Fringe Benefit Chart, however, they are required to submit a total compensation plan.

q. DCAA AND DCMA INFORMATION

Offerors shall complete **Exhibits C-15** and C-15A and provide the requested information necessary to contact appropriate audit authorities regarding the Offeror's business systems, status of financial disclosures, negotiated forward pricing rates, etc. Offerors must ensure that the information provided is current and accurate.

3. Deviations/Exceptions (Cost Volume)

Explain any deviations, exceptions, or conditional assumptions taken with respect to the cost volume instructions or requirements. Any deviations, exceptions, etc. must be supported by sufficient amplification and justification to permit evaluation.

(End of provision)

L.17 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME (SEP 2010)

An Offeror's past performance record indicates the relevant quantitative and qualitative aspects of performing services or delivering products similar in size, content, and/or complexity to the requirements of this acquisition.

The Offeror shall provide, at a minimum, the following information in support of its proposal to facilitate the evaluation of the offeror's past performance as related to the requirements of the proposed contract.

(a) INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR

Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$2,500,000 that your company has had within the last 3 years of the RFP release date. Indicate which contracts are most related (i.e. similar in size, content, and/or complexity) and how they are related to the proposed effort, as well as which contracts were performed by the division of your company (if applicable) that will perform the proposed contract/subcontract.

A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$1,500,000. *Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation.* The offeror shall provide the information requested below for any significant subcontractor(s) for those similar efforts within the last 3 years of the RFP release date with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 25% of the estimated average annual dollar value of the proposed significant subcontract.

For example (note, these example numbers may not relate to this specific procurement), if a procurement is valued at an average annual value of \$50M and a proposed significant subcontractor for the effort has a proposed average annual cost/fee of \$16M, the offeror shall provide relevant current/past contract references that have a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred at/above \$4M (25% of \$16M) for that significant subcontractor.

If a prime offeror or significant subcontractor is submitting past performance data on a current/past contract vehicle that includes multiple tasks, orders, etc, all effort under that contract vehicle may be consolidated for the purposes of meeting the average annual cost/fee incurred in the instructions above and for the purpose of evaluating contract relevance for the proposed requirement.

Offerors shall estimate prime contract and significant subcontract percentages and value based on an assumption that the contract will meet the Maximum Ordering Value and performance will reflect all areas of the statement of work (offerors shall also consider other RFP information and available historical performance data in this estimate).

Indicate the primary functions (SOW, WBS, etc) to be performed by the prime offeror and each proposed significant subcontractor. Indicate which contracts are most related (i.e. similar in size, content, and/or complexity) and how they are related to the proposed effort, as well as which

contracts were performed by the division of your company (if applicable) that will perform the proposed contract/subcontract.

If applicable, Offerors may provide the experience or past performance of a parent or affiliated or predecessor company to an Offeror (including a parent or affiliated company that is being otherwise proposed as a subcontractor on this effort) where the firm's proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor will affect the performance of the Offeror. The Offeror shall demonstrate that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company (its workforce, management, facilities or other resources) shall be provided or relied upon for contract performance such that the parent or affiliate or predecessor will have meaningful involvement in contract performance.

The offeror shall provide the following information on all past/current contract references that meet the above criteria for the prime offeror and each significant subcontractor:

- Customer's name, address, and telephone number of both the lead contractual and technical personnel most familiar with the offeror's performance record. *(Please verify the telephone numbers provided are current and correct).*
- Cage Code and/or DUNS Number of the contractor performing the work.
- Contract number, type, and total original and present or final contract value.
- The current contract expenditures incurred to date, the date in which the expenditures have been incurred through, and the Average Annual Cost/Fee Incurred to Date. For example (note, these example numbers may not relate to this specific procurement):

A current five year contract that you are performing has a total estimated value of \$100,000,000. As of the latest cost report which reflected cost/fee through the first 2 years and 4 months of performance, the total amount of cost/fee incurred by the offeror over the duration of the contract was \$43,500,000.

In this example, an Offeror would provide the following:

- Current Contract Expenditures incurred to Date: \$43,500,000
- Date in which Expenditures have been incurred through: Insert Date of cost report that indicated cost/fee total of \$43,500,000 after 2 years and 4 months of performance.
- Average Annual Cost/Fee Incurred to Date: \$18,669,528 ($\$43,500,000/2.33$ years)
- Date of contract, place(s) of performance, and delivery dates or period of performance.
- Brief description of contract work and comparability to the proposed effort. It is not sufficient to state that it is comparable in magnitude and scope. Rationale must be provided to demonstrate that it is comparable.
- Method of acquisition: competitive or noncompetitive.
- Nature of award: initial or follow-on. If initial, indicate whether award was preceded by a Government, customer, or offeror financed study.
- Identify and explain major technical problems and how they were overcome. List any major deviations or waivers to technical requirements that were granted by the customer.
- Identify and explain completion successes and delays, including adherence to program schedules. Provide an assessment of the performance (technical and schedule) on these past programs and support these assessments with metrics such as award or incentive fees earned.
- Cost management history; identify and explain any cost overruns and underruns, and cost incentive history, if applicable.
- Average number of personnel on the contract per year and percent turnover of personnel per year.
- Recent customer evaluations of past performance including Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, etc. (Excluded

from the page limitation).

- Small Business Subcontracting Plan history; provide latest Individual Subcontract Report (ISR) and Summary Subcontract Report (SSR) (formerly known as the SF 294 and 295 reports) and supporting rationale (Excluded from the page limitation).
- List any contracts terminated (partial or complete) within the past 5 years and basis for termination (convenience or default). Include the contract number, name, address, and telephone number of the terminating officer (please verify telephone numbers). Include contracts that were "descoped" by the customer because of performance or cost problems. (Excluded from the page limitation).

(b) PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRES

The offeror and any proposed significant subcontractor(s) [as defined in paragraph (a)] shall provide the questionnaires provided as **Exhibit B** to each of the above references to establish a record of past performance. The Offeror shall instruct each of its references to return the questionnaire directly to the Government in a sealed envelope. The questionnaire respondent shall be a representative from the technical customer and responsible Contracting Officer with direct knowledge of your firm's performance. If possible, the Offeror and any proposed significant subcontractor(s) shall provide questionnaires to customers from NASA contracts, other Government contracts, and commercial contracts. For proposed significant subcontractor(s), references shall concern only work performed by the subcontractor's business entity that will perform the work under this contract, if awarded.

The Offeror is responsible for ensuring that the questionnaire is completed and submitted directly to the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center Contracting Officer no later than the closing date of this solicitation designated in Block 9 of the SF 33:

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center

Attn: Jennifer O'Connell, Code 210.5

Bldg. 22, Rm. 116

Greenbelt Road

Greenbelt, MD 20771

Telephone: 301-286-5081

FAX: 301-286-5373

Email: Jennifer.A.Oconnell@nasa.gov

The Offeror shall include a list of those to whom the questionnaires were sent, including name of individual, phone number, organization, and contract number. Offerors shall include in their proposal the written consent of their proposed significant subcontractors (excluded from the page limitation) to allow the Government to discuss the subcontractors' past performance evaluation with the Offeror.

The offeror shall provide a copy of any binding teaming agreements or other contractual agreements (which creates legal responsibilities on the part of the significant subcontractor) (excluded from the page limitation).

(c) SUMMARY OF DEVIATIONS/EXCEPTIONS (PAST PERFORMANCE PROPOSAL)

Identify and explain the reason for any deviations, exceptions, or conditional assumptions taken with respect to these Past Performance Proposal instructions.

(End of provision)

L.18 PROPOSAL MARKING AND DELIVERY (JAN 2010)

(Offeror: You MUST comply with these instructions to ensure that the designated receiving office can identify, date and time mark, secure, and deliver your proposal to the Contracting Officer.)

1. External Marking of Proposal Package(s)

All proposal packages must be closed and sealed.

The proposal package must include the offeror's name and return mailing address.

The required mailing address and external marking for proposals is as follows:

"Goddard Space Flight Center

Greenbelt, MD 20771

Building 16W—Shipping and Receiving Dock

Solicitation Number NNG10316070R

Attn: Jennifer O'Connell

Bldg 25, Room N40

PROPOSAL--DELIVER UNOPENED"

Suggested additional marking if delivery is made by a commercial delivery service:

"COMMERCIAL DELIVERY PERSONNEL: THIS PROPOSAL MUST BE DELIVERED TO THE DOCK MASTER, BUILDING 16W SHIPPING AND RECEIVING DOCK, NO LATER THAN (OFFEROR—ENTER DATE AND TIME)."

2. Designated Receiving Office

The designated receiving office for proposals is the Shipping and Receiving Dock, Building 16W, Goddard Space Flight Center, which must be accessed from Hubble Road off of Soil

Conservation Road, north from Greenbelt Road. Proposals must be received at the designated receiving office **no later than the date and time stated on the solicitation face page.**

The Building 16W Shipping and Receiving dock is open from 7:30AM to 3:30PM, Monday through Friday, except Government holidays. Contractor personnel conduct the GSFC receiving function, which includes mailroom operations. Proposals must be marked with the date and time of receipt, subjected to security screening, secured, and delivered unopened to the Contracting Officer.

There is no public access to the Building 16W Shipping and Receiving Dock. GSFC passes are required for access to the receiving dock.

3. Methods of Proposal Delivery

There are three suggested methods of delivery to the designated proposal receiving office:

U.S. Postal Service Express Mail

Commercial Delivery Service

Delivery by company employee or other individual agent

It is highly encouraged for all offerors to use U.S. Postal Service Express Mail or Commercial Delivery Services.

If proposals are going to be delivered by a company employee or other individual agent that does not already have badged access to NASA/GSFC, the offeror **MUST** comply with the following instructions and allow sufficient time (potentially one hour or more) for security processing through the North Gate on Hubble Road:

- a. Vehicle must use the Truck Inspection lane (far right lane).

- b. Driver (and any passenger(s)) must be a U.S. Citizen (no exceptions).
- c. Driver shall state that they are delivering a proposal and provide the specific Solicitation Number. Driver must show a copy of the solicitation cover page (or appropriate solicitation instructions or amendment), which includes the solicitation number and proposal due date. The delivery date should be within 1 week of the proposal due date. The solicitation number shall match the solicitation number on the properly marked proposal packages (see section 1 of this provision).
- d. Driver (and any passenger(s)) must provide a valid Driver's License to the Security Officer for identification and recording purposes.
- e. Vehicle must undergo a GSFC Security vehicle inspection.
- f. Driver will be provided with a pass authorizing them to proceed directly to the Shipping and Receiving Dock, Building 16W, ONLY.
- g. After delivering the proposal, the vehicle must immediately exit GSFC back through the North Gate.
- h. If the Solicitation documentation is not provided, the proposal packages are not properly marked, or the driver/vehicle does not pass security procedures, the driver may not be granted access through the North Gate and will be instructed to go the GSFC Main Gate on Greenbelt Road for security processing. If this happens, the driver should contact the Contracting Officer named in this solicitation for further assistance. Note, any delays associated with this process will not result in the Government's acceptance of a late proposal, which is why the use of the U.S. Postal Service or Commercial Delivery Services are highly encouraged.

Regardless of the method of delivery chosen, the offeror is responsible for delivery of the proposal to the designated receiving office no later than the date and time stated on the face page of the solicitation.

(End of provision)

L.19 LIST OF ACRONYMS APPENDIX

The offeror shall provide a list of acronyms used in its proposal. The list should be comprehensive without including extraneous acronyms. It shall be provided in the Mission Suitability Volume, Cost and Past Performance Volumes as Appendix A.

(End of provision)

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M. 1 52.222-46 EVALUATION OF COMPENSATION FOR PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES (FEB 1993)

(a) Recompensation of service contracts may in some cases result in lowering the compensation (salaries and fringe benefits) paid or furnished professional employees. This lowering can be detrimental in obtaining the quality of professional services needed for adequate contract performance. It is therefore in the Government's best interest that professional employees, as defined in 29 CFR 541, be properly and fairly compensated. As a part of their proposals, offerors will submit a total compensation plan setting forth salaries and fringe benefits proposed for the professional employees who will work under the contract. The Government will evaluate the plan to assure that it reflects a sound management approach and understanding of the contract requirements. This evaluation will include an assessment of the offeror's ability to provide uninterrupted high-quality work. The professional compensation proposed will be considered in terms of its impact upon recruiting and retention, its realism, and its consistency with a total plan for compensation. Supporting information will include data, such as recognized national and regional compensation surveys and studies of professional, public and private organizations, used in establishing the total compensation structure.

(b) The compensation levels proposed should reflect a clear understanding of work to be performed and should indicate the capability of the proposed compensation structure to obtain and keep suitably qualified personnel to meet mission objectives. The salary rates or ranges must take into account differences in skills, the complexity of various disciplines, and professional job difficulty. Additionally, proposals envisioning compensation levels lower than those of predecessor contractors for the same work will be evaluated on the basis of maintaining program continuity, uninterrupted high- quality work, and availability of required competent professional service employees. Offerors are cautioned that lowered compensation for essentially the same professional work may indicate lack of sound management judgment and lack of understanding of the requirement.

(c) The Government is concerned with the quality and stability of the work force to be employed on this contract. Professional compensation that is unrealistically low or not in reasonable relationship to the various job categories, since it may impair the Contractor's ability to attract and retain competent professional service employees, may be viewed as evidence of failure to comprehend the complexity of the contract requirements.

(d) Failure to comply with these provisions may constitute sufficient cause to justify rejection of a proposal.

(End of provision)

M.2 PROSPECTIVE CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITY

(a) The standards and procedures for determining whether prospective contractors and subcontractors are responsible are set forth in FAR Subpart 9.1. Deficiencies concerning the general standards of prospective contractor responsibility at FAR 9.104-1, and any special standards established for this procurement under FAR 9.104-2, may be serious enough to result in a determination of non-responsibility. As with all aspects of prospective contractor responsibility, a finding of non-responsibility can be made at any time prior to contract award. However, even if such deficiencies are not so serious to result in such a determination, they will nonetheless be considered in the evaluation as conducted under the evaluation factors set forth in this solicitation.

(b) The following special standards of responsibility have been established for this procurement:

None

(End of text)

M.3 SOURCE SELECTION AND EVALUATION FACTORS--GENERAL

1. Source Selection

This competitive negotiated acquisition shall be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.3, "Source Selection", and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3, same subject. The Source Evaluation Board procedures at NFS 1815.370, "NASA formal source selection" will apply.

The attention of offerors is particularly directed to NFS 1815.305, "Proposal evaluation" and to NFS 1815.305-70, "Identification of unacceptable proposals".

A trade-off process, as described at FAR 15.101-1, will be used in making source selection.

2. Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

The evaluation factors are Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. These factors, as described at NFS 1815.304-70, will be used to evaluate each proposal. This Section M provides a further description for each evaluation factor, inclusive of subfactor.

3. Relative Order of Importance of Evaluation Factors

The relative importance of the three subfactors for Mission Suitability are as follows:

Subfactor B – Management Approach, Subfactor A- Understanding the Key Requirements of the Statement of Work and Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTOs), and Subfactor C – Small Business Utilization.

As individual factors, Subfactor A – Understanding the Key Requirements of the Statement of Work and Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTOs) is slightly less important than the Subfactor B – Management Approach but is slightly more important than Subfactor C – Small Business Utilization.

The Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual Factors, the Past Performance Factor is less important than the Mission Suitability Factor but is slightly more important than the Cost Factor.

(End of provision)

M.4 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR

The Mission Suitability evaluation will take into consideration whether the resources proposed are consistent with the proposed efforts and accomplishments associated with each subfactor or whether they are overstated or understated for the effort to be accomplished as described by the offeror and evaluated by NASA. The offeror's justification for the proposed resources will be considered in this evaluation. If the offeror's proposal demonstrates a lack of resource realism, it will be evaluated as demonstrating a lack of understanding of or commitment to the requirements.

1. Mission Suitability Subfactors and Description of Each Subfactor

Subfactor A – Understanding the Key Statement of Work Requirements and Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTO)

The Government will evaluate the depth and breadth of the offeror's understanding and technical approach to meet the objectives and technical difficulties of the limited areas of the Statement of Work (SOW) as follows: 1.1 Earth Gravity Field; 1.2 Planetary Gravity Modeling; 1.3 Non-Conservative Force Modeling; 1.5 Terrestrial Reference Frame; 1.6 Time-Variable Gravity; 1.7 Geophysical Fluids Influences on Global Geodynamics; 1.8 Sea Level and Tides; 1.10 Geomagnetic Infrastructure Support; 2.1 ICESat Science Standard Data Products; 2.2 Radar Altimeter Performance Analysis; 2.4 Polar Ice Science Using Altimetry; 2.5 ICESat/GLAS/CRYoSat; 2.6 Ice Penetrating Radar; 2.7 Ice Sheet Satellite Data Analysis; 2.9 Digital Topography Assessment and Analysis; 2.11 Altimetry of Inland Water Bodies; 2.12

Remote Sensing Instrument Development; 3.1 GEODYN; 3.3 Analysis Software; 3.5 Software Development of Ranging, Altimeter and Transponder Experiments and Information Technology (IT) Support to Goddard's Geophysical and Astronomical Observatory (GGAO); and 3.7 ICESAT-2/ATLAS Flight Algorithm Development Support.

The Government will evaluate the offerors understanding of the requirements and the inherent challenges for thoroughness, completeness, and appropriateness. The Government will evaluate the offeror's proper identification of risks, the risk management techniques, the proposed risk management approach including the following: the probability of risk, impact and severity, timeframe and acceptance or mitigation for realism.

The government will evaluate the offeror's proposed technical approach which shall demonstrate an understanding of the requirements and provide the techniques and procedures that will be used to satisfy the requirements in a timely and cost effective manner.

The Government will evaluate the offeror's understanding for and response to any key scientific principles that are described in their approach.

Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders

The following applies to both RTO 1 and RTO 2.

The Offeror's response to the Representative Task Orders (RTO), presented in Exhibit A & B of the RFP, will serve as a basis for the evaluation of how the Offeror will carry out specific tasks associated with the SOW.

The Offeror will be evaluated on how it will implement and staff the RTO. The Government will evaluate the Offeror on how well it demonstrates an understanding of the task's objectives and problems. The proposed Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) for the RTO's will be evaluated for reasonableness and completeness. In evaluation of the RTOs, the Government will also consider the following: Thoroughness and merit of discussion of how the task would be accomplished, including technical approach, Government interface and schedule; Completeness and accuracy in the identification of potential technical problems, risks and critical issues, thoroughness of response to the problem mitigation/resolution, and reasonableness of the basis of any assumptions made; Realism and merit of proposed staffing plan, including staffing levels by labor category and skill level to accomplish the objectives; Realism of additional resources necessary to successfully complete the task.

The Offeror will be evaluated on the reasonableness and merit of the proposed staffing.

The Government will evaluate any new or innovative methods, techniques or technologies that are proposed by the offeror for the task with respect to their benefit to the Government. The

Government will evaluate the proposed method, technique or technology and how they impact the performance. The Government will also evaluate the realism of efficiencies that were quantified.

The following applies to RTO 1 only.

The Government will evaluate the soundness and appropriateness of the offeror's grasp of the principles and citations to literature underlying this RTO.

The Government will evaluate the offeror's proposed expertise and familiarity with the GEODYN (latest version), ORAN, ERODYN, and SOLVE software packages. The government will evaluate the offeror's demonstration to modify and extend the capabilities of these software packages.

The offeror will be evaluated on the suite of tracking data (SLR, DORIS, GPS) for altimeter satellite missions and how they would compute and validate precise orbits for altimeter satellites.

The following applies to RTO 2 only.

The Government will evaluate the soundness of the offeror's familiarity with the four major types of space geodesy techniques and the services supporting these techniques and GGOS. The evaluation will assess knowledge of the data and derived products (including file formats) and current understanding of the IAG services supporting the techniques and their future plans that affect data and product archiving efforts.

The Government will evaluate the offeror's proposed expertise and familiarity with database management systems (MySQL) and published metadata standards, including those used by EOSDIS and GCMD. The Government will evaluate the offeror's demonstration to modify and extend metadata standard implementation in Solar Systems Exploration division data systems, in particular space geodetic data archive systems.

The Government will evaluate the offeror's expertise and familiarity with various programming languages and methodologies used in data archiving, including metadata extraction, web-based data discovery, and web development technology.

Subfactor B – Management Approach

Under this subfactor, the Government will evaluate the Offeror's organization structure, policies, procedures and techniques proposed for their adequacy to manage the work under the contract for appropriateness. The Offeror's description of the interrelationships of technical management, business management, subcontract management, and techniques to be employed to assure cost effectiveness will be evaluated for thoroughness and reasonableness. The processes and procedures for configuration management, performance assurance, and overall work planning and reporting will be evaluated for thoroughness.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's use of all proposed subcontractors or other associated contractual arrangements in terms of the functionality of these arrangements in meeting the Statement of work requirements and the benefits of these arrangements to the Government. The Offeror's approach to the functional split of responsibilities, including potential percentages of work to be performed, between the prime and significant subcontractors will be evaluated for effectiveness. The Offeror's approach to management and reporting to GSFC of subcontractors' financial and technical plans and performance and organization chart for subcontractor will be evaluated for reasonableness and effectiveness.

The Offeror's plan for staffing, maintaining and augmenting a qualified workforce will be evaluated based on the ability to meet contract needs in a timely manner. The Offeror's ability to provide any necessary support to perform under the resultant contract, respond to critical requirements, and staff new requirements from existing resources and from outside resources will be evaluated for reasonableness and effectiveness. The Offeror's plan for staffing for phase-in will be evaluated based on the ability to meet contract needs in a timely manner.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's corporate resources, other facilities, equipment, and management tools. Facilities and equipment proposed will be evaluated based on relevancy, capabilities, available capacity, and proximity to the Washington-Baltimore metropolitan area. Any proposed management tools will be evaluated regarding their applicability and potential value to the government relative to the contract.

The proposed position descriptions will be evaluated for appropriateness and merit.

PHASE-IN PLAN – (The government anticipates Phase-In to be issued as Task 1)

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's phase-in approach for continuity and a smooth transition with the incumbent contractor during the 30-day phase-in period. The Government will evaluate how clearly the phase-in plan demonstrates an ability to assume full contract

responsibility on the effective date of the contract. The Government will evaluate how the phase-in plan specifically address how ongoing work will be maintained, the proposed management organization, schedule, staffing plan, orientation and training of personnel. If proposed, the Government will evaluate for reasonableness, any assumptions or dependencies of the incumbent contractor. The Offeror's plan to address its timely preparation of the Personal Identity Verification (PIV) requirements will be evaluated. The Government will also evaluate the extent of involvement of NASA personnel during the 30-day phase-in period.

Quality Assurance Plan

The offeror's proposed internal quality assurance plan will be evaluated for adequacy and ability to demonstrate that the Offeror can ensure the Government will receive the services for which it is contracting. More specifically, the Government will evaluate the level, frequency, and method of internal surveillance and what the Offeror proposes as the method for identifying deficiencies in the quality of services provided and plans for correcting those deficiencies.

Total Compensation Plan

The Government will evaluate the offeror's total compensation plan including fringe benefits to determine if it reflects a sound management approach and understanding of contract requirements. The total compensation plan will be evaluated for the Offeror's ability to provide uninterrupted high-quality work. The salary rates or ranges will be evaluated for their ability to recognize the distinct differences in professional skills and the complexity of varied disciplines as well as job difficulty. The offeror's supporting data used in establishing the total professional compensation structure will be evaluated for reasonableness and to obtain and retain qualified personnel to meet mission objectives. The total compensation plan proposed will be evaluated for its expected impact on recruiting and retention, its realism, and its consistency with a total plan for compensation. Because of the possible effort on the Offeror's ability to retain a competent workforce, a total compensation plan that is unrealistically low or not in reasonable relationship to the various labor categories, may be viewed as evidence of failure to comprehend the complexity of the contract requirements. If incumbent capture is proposed, the Government will evaluate the reasonableness of the Offeror's approach to attracting and retaining incumbent staff.

In accordance with the Exhibit C14A & C14B "Fringe Benefits Chart", the Government will evaluate the offeror's and all service subcontractors (as defined in paragraph (d) of NFS provision 1852.231-71) provided detailed list of their fringe benefits and company estimated cost per hour, along with an itemization of the benefits that require employee contributions and the amount of that contribution as a percentage of the total cost of the benefit. Two exhibits shall be submitted, one containing the average of fringe benefit information for all the exempt labor categories and one containing the average of fringe benefit information for all the non-exempt

labor categories. (The Mission Suitability Proposal must not include Exhibit C14A & C14B, but should reference where the information appears in the Cost Proposal.)

The Government will evaluate the provided supporting data, such as recognized national, regional, and local compensation surveys and studies of professional, public and private organizations, used in establishing the total professional compensation structure.

Mentor-Protégé Program

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's NASA Mentor Protégé Program planned participation description for thoroughness and completeness. The Government will evaluate the offerors past experiences in the in the Mentor-Protégé Program for appropriateness.

Safety and Health Plan

The Offeror's proposed Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated to determine whether its approach is compliant with applicable Federal and State statutory and regulatory requirements, NPG 8715.3, and applicable NASA Agency-wide and Installation specific policies and/or procedure including the adequacy of protection of life, health, and well being of NASA and Contractor employees, property and equipment. The Government will evaluate the adequacy of the offeror's Safety and Health Plan to ensure that supplies and services are furnished in a safe and healthful manner, and that the offeror develops, produces, and/or delivers products to NASA that will be safe and successful for their intended use. The Government will evaluate the offeror's compliance with including all required contents of the Safety and Health Plan in accordance with NPR 8715.3. Offerors' past safety record and accident history will be evaluated.

The content of the Safety and Health Plan will be assessed for completeness and appropriateness. Any exceptions to the Safety and Health Plan will be assessed for appropriateness.

The offeror's plan for handling hazardous materials identified in Clause I.4, Hazardous Material Identification and Material Safety Data (FAR 52.223-3 Alternate I), clause will be evaluated for completeness and compliance.

Subfactor C – Small Business Utilization

The evaluation of Small Business Subcontracting Plan, as required by FAR clause 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan and its Alternate II, applies to all Offerors, except small businesses. The evaluation of Commitment to Small Business Program applies to all Offerors.

The evaluation of SDB participation applies to all Offerors.

(a) Small Business Subcontracting

(1) The Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated in terms of the Offeror's proposed subcontracting goals (overall subcontracting goals and individual subcontracting goals by category) in comparison to the Contracting Officers assessment of the appropriate subcontracting goals for this procurement. The offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan will also be evaluated in terms of meeting the requirements of FAR 19.704 Subcontracting Plan Requirements. NASA will consider the amount of work being retained for performance by the prime contractor in-house when determining whether a subcontracting plan is acceptable. The evaluation of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be on the basis of IDIQ MAXIMUM ORDERING VALUE.

(2) For purposes of small business that are not required to submit subcontracting plans, NASA will evaluate the amount of work proposed to be done by a small business either at the prime level or at the first tier subcontract level. This evaluation for small businesses will not involve any of the other categories in the small business contracting plan.

(b) Commitment to Small Businesses

(1) NASA will evaluate the extent to which the work performed by a small business subcontractor(s) is defined as "high technology". NASA also will evaluate the extent of commitment to use the subcontractor(s) (enforceable vs. non-enforceable commitments).

(2) NASA will evaluate the extent to which the identity of the small business subcontractor is specified in the proposal as well as the extent of the commitment to use small businesses. (For small business offerors, NASA will evaluate this only if there subcontracting opportunities exist.)

(3) NASA will evaluate the Offeror's established or planned procedures and organizational structure for SDB outreach, assistance, participation in the Mentor Protégé program, counseling, market research and SDB identification, and relevant purchasing procedures. (For large businesses Offerors, this information should conform to its submitted Small Business Subcontracting Plan. For small business offerors, NASA will evaluate this only if subcontracting opportunities exist.)

(c) SDB Participation – Contract Targets

The Government will evaluate the reasonableness of the proposed SDB participation targets in those industries designated by the Department of Commerce as underrepresented areas by NAICS Industry Subsector along with supporting rationale against IDIQ MAXIMUM ORDERING VALUE. Specific identification of SDB targets and associated work will be evaluated for feasibility.

2. **Evaluation Findings**

The relative importance of the three subfactors for Mission Suitability are as follows:

Subfactor B – Management Approach, Subfactor A- Understanding the Key Requirements of the Statement of Work and Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTOs), and Subfactor C – Small Business Utilization.

As individual factors, Subfactor A – Understanding the Key Requirements of the Statement of Work and Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTOs) is slightly less important than the Subfactor B – Management Approach but is slightly more important than Subfactor C – Small Business Utilization.

The Government will evaluate proposals by classifying findings as strengths, weaknesses, significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies using the following:

Weakness – a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance

Significant Weakness – a proposal flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance

Deficiency – a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level

Strength (not in FAR/NFS) – a proposal area that enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government (this could be associated with a process, technical approach, materials, facilities, etc.).

Significant Strength (not in FAR/NFS) – a proposal area that greatly enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

After classifying findings, the Offeror's proposals will receive one of the following adjectival ratings:

<u>ADJECTIVAL RATING</u>	<u>DEFINITIONS</u>
Excellent	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists.
Very Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates over-all competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.
Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the offeror's response.
Fair	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strength.
Poor	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.

The Mission Suitability evaluation will include the results of any cost realism analysis.

(End of provision)

M.5 COST EVALUATION FACTOR

The proposed costs of the RTOs and the rates proposed in Attachment B, Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates and Fixed Fee Matrices, will be assessed to determine reasonableness and cost realism. The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B) and (C).

Offerors should refer to FAR 2.101(b) for a definition of “cost realism” and to FAR 15.404-1(d) for a discussion of “cost realism analysis” and “probable cost”.

Both “proposed and probable cost” will reflect the offeror’s proposed fee amount. Any proposed fee is not adjusted in the probable cost assessment.

The proposed and probable Representative Task Order Costs, and the proposed phase-in cost will be presented to the Source Selection Authority.

(End of text)

M.6 PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR (SEP 2010)

An offeror’s past performance will be evaluated based on FAR Part 15 and the evaluation criteria in this provision. All past performance references must meet the “recent” and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria provided below for both prime contractor references and significant subcontractor references in order to be evaluated.

For purposes of past performance, the term “offeror” refers to a prime contractor and its significant subcontractors. Accordingly, the past performance of significant(s) subcontractors shall also be evaluated and attributed to the offeror. The past performance of a significant subcontractor will be compared to the work proposed to be performed by that subcontractor, and weighted accordingly in assigning the overall past performance adjectival rating to the offeror. Evidence of a binding teaming agreement or other contractual agreement which creates legal responsibilities on the part of the significant subcontractors may be given more weight in the evaluation of significant subcontractors, in comparison to proposals that lack such agreements and/or evidence. The past performance of the prime contractor will be weighted more heavily than any significant subcontractor or combination of significant subcontractors in the overall past performance evaluation.

A “recent” contract is a contract that is ongoing or completed less than 3 years prior to the issuance of this RFP. Contracts completed more than 3 years prior to issuance of this RFP will not be considered recent and will not be considered or evaluated.

A “relevant” contract depends on the size, content, and/or complexity of the contract with respect to this acquisition.

For a prime contractor’s contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally “relevant”, it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least \$2,500,000.

A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$1,500,000. *Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation.*

For a significant subcontractor’s contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally “relevant”, it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 25% of that portion of this procurement that the subcontractor is proposed (or estimated) to perform.

If the contract is deemed recent and meets the above minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria, the Government will then determine the degree of relevance - ie., level of pertinence - of the contract based on size, content, and/or complexity. Content and/or complexity are more important than size in the evaluation of relevance. The term “content” means the type of services, work, or supplies. The term “complexity” means the difficulty of the work or level of the skill mix required to complete the work. The Government may consider past quantities and periods of performance in evaluating overall relevance.

The performance evaluation will be based primarily on customer satisfaction and/or contract data in meeting technical, schedule, cost, and management requirements. Additional performance factors may include contract administration, occupational health, safety, security, subcontracting plan goals and small disadvantaged business participation targets, if applicable, and other contract requirements.

The Government may review and consider past performance information on other contracts that it is aware of or that are made available from other sources and inquiries with previous customers. These contracts (if any) must meet the above “recent” and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria to be evaluated.

As part of the past performance evaluation, the Government may attribute the experience or past performance of a parent or affiliated or predecessor company (including a parent or affiliated company that is being otherwise proposed as a subcontractor on this effort) to the proposed

prime contractor and/or significant subcontractor(s) where the proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company will affect the performance of the proposed prime contractor and/or significant subcontractor(s). The Government will take into consideration whether the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company (its workforce, management, facilities or other resources) will be provided or relied upon for contract performance such that the parent or affiliate will have meaningful involvement in contract performance. These contracts (if any) must meet the above “recent” and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria to be evaluated.

An offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of “recent” and “relevant” past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the offeror will receive a “Neutral” rating. However, an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures indicated above may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information.

The Government will consider an offeror’s explanation of any problems encountered on any identified contracts, and any corrective actions taken by the offeror.

The overall confidence rating assigned to an offeror’s Past Performance (see below) will reflect a subjective evaluation of the information contained in the oral presentation, if applicable; written narrative; past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires; and other references, if any, that the Government may contact for additional past performance information.

Past Performance Ratings – The level of confidence ratings set forth below will be used to evaluate the Past Performance factor for each offeror.

Each of the adjective ratings below has a "performance" component and a "relevance" component as discussed above. As used in the ratings below, the term “pertinent” is equivalent to the term “relevant.” The following adjectival rating guidelines will be used when subjectively assessing both components.

Very High Level of Confidence

The Offeror’s relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror’s performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

High Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Moderate Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Low Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.

Very Low Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which, adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Neutral

In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)].

(End of provision)

M. 7 OFFER/NO OFFER RESPONSE SHEET

Compliance is requested, but not required. This page may be used to indicate whether your company intends to submit an offer in response to this solicitation. You may also indicate your intent by E-Mail or FAX. The E-Mail address is Jennifer.A.OConnell@nasa.gov. The FAX number is (301) 286-5373. If mailed, return the completed page to the individual and address on the face page of this solicitation.

The _____(name of firm) (/ / intends) (/ / does not intend) to submit an offer in response to NNG10316070R.

(End of text)